

REMARKS

The following is in response to the Final Office Action dated January 18, 2005, and the Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the claim rejections in this case in light of the following. Regarding the Advisory Action dated April 28, 2005, claim 30 is no longer being amended in any manner, meaning no new issues are raised by the present Response.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 24-26 and 29-31 were pending.

Claims 24-26, 29, and 31 have been cancelled.

Claim 30 remains before the Examiner for consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

In the Office Action, all the pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,016,801 to Gilat et al. ("Gilat") in combination with various features in regards to which the Examiner has taken official notice. Some of claims have been cancelled. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that previously-presented Claim 30 is patentable over Gilat, for the reasons set forth below.

More specifically, as stated in the previous Response, Claim 30 relates to the embodiment of the present invention discussed starting at Page 7, line 5. There, the take up mechanism for duplicating the path length of the first ribbon relative to the second ribbon comprises a lower take up roller and an upper take up roller. The ribbon is wrapped around the lower take up roller and then around the upper take up roller, and the two rollers are biased apart for tensioning the ribbon. Also, one or both of the take up rollers is horizontally adjustable, to increase or decrease the effective path length of the ribbon, while minimizing the height of the apparatus (*i.e.*, horizontal adjustment, as opposed to vertical adjustment, allows for changing the path length without adding to the clearance height required for the device). This is done for purposes of adjusting the path length of the ribbon, without shifting or angling the ribbon, and such a feature is recited in the claims (*e.g.*, the take up rollers being positioned perpendicularly with respect to the direction of travel of the ribbon).

Gilat does not disclose an apparatus where an upper or lower take up roller is "adjustable in a horizontal direction for adjusting the path length of the second ribbon relative to the first ribbon while minimizing the vertical height of the apparatus" (emphasis added), as is recited in Claim 30. Instead, with reference to FIG. 5 in Gilat, the lower take up roller 80 is vertically adjustable, while the upper roller 62 is not adjustable at all. See Col. 4, lines 36-44 (emphasizing that the roller 80 is adjustable in a vertical direction). Gilat also fails to show a lower roller that lies forward of an upper roller, as is also recited in Claim 30, i.e., with reference to FIG. 2 in the present application, roller 160 lies forward of roller 134. Instead, in Gilat the roller 62 lies to the rear of roller 80. (The lower/first roller is the roller that the ribbon encounters first.) Again, it must be emphasized that the purpose of these features is for adjusting the path length of the second ribbon while reducing the vertical size of the apparatus as a whole.

Because Gilat neither shows nor suggests these limitations, the Applicant respectfully asserts that Claim 30 is not obvious in light of Gilat, and, therefore, is allowable. The Applicant also notes that the Office Action is silent as to these claim limitations, i.e., the Examiner does not identify where in the prior art or otherwise these features are found.

It should also be noted that although the turnbar rollers 64,70 in Gilat appear horizontally adjustable, these do not correspond to the take up rollers recited in Claim 30.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 30 is allowable. If the Examiner disagrees, it is requested that the amendments set forth above be entered as canceling claims for appeal. 37 CFR § 1.116(b).

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAY 11 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By

John A. Kramer
John A. Kramer
Registration No. 46,302
Attorney For Applicant

McCORMICK, PAULDING & HUBER LLP
CityPlace II, 185 Asylum Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3402
(860) 549-5290 x1021

PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

The Applicant hereby petitions for a one-month extension of time to file the present Response, thereby extending the period for response through and to May 18, 2005. The Commissioner is authorized to charge the extension fee and any fees under 37 CFR 1.17(a) to (d), which may be required to Deposit Account No. 13-0235.

Respectfully submitted,

By

John A. Kramer
John A. Kramer
Registration No. 46,302
Attorney For Applicant